Fiscal Estimate - 2011 Session

| | Original | | Updated | | Corrected | | Supplemental |
|---------------------------|--|-------------------|---|--------------|--|----------|---------------------|
| LRB N | Number 11-1560 |)/2 | | Introd | luction Number | SB-1 | 91 |
| Descrip Awardin | otion ng costs in administrative | e agency | v actions | | | | |
| Fiscal E | Effect | | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | o State Fiscal Effect determinate Increase Existing Appropriations Decrease Existing Appropriations Create New Appropria | tions | Increase Existing Revenues Decrease Existin Revenues | | Increase Costs - within agency's t Yes Decrease Costs | | possible to absorb |
| | lo Local Government Condeterminate . Increase Costs . Permissive Mand . Decrease Costs | 3. atory 4. | ☐ Increase Revenue ☐ Permissive ☐ Mar ☐ Decrease Revenu ☐ Permissive ☐ Mar | ndatory e | 5.Types of Local G Affected Towns Counties | □v □o | ent Units illage |
| Fund Se | ources Affected R | ю [| PRS 🗌 SEG | ☐ SE | Affected Ch. 20 GS | Approp | riations |
| Agency | /Prepared By | | Autho | rized S | ignature | | Date |
| DOT/ R | obert Kranz (608) 264-9 | 968 | Stepha | anie LaS | Sage (608) 267-3703 | | 10/3/2011 |

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOT 10/3/2011

| LRB Number | 11-1560/2 | Introduction Number | SB-191 | Estimate Type | Original | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------------------|--------|---------------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Description | | | | | | | | | | |
| Awarding costs in administrative agency actions | | | | | | | | | | |

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

The bill eliminates all current law financial and entity size limitations for prevailing parties to be eligible to receive costs in administrative agency actions, unless the court finds the agency was substantially justified in taking its position or if such an award would be unjust under the circumstances.

The bill also eliminates the current law requirement that hearing examiners and courts rely on federal case law interpreting substantially similar provisions under the federal equal access to justice act when interpreting the provisions governing costs to prevailing parties.

Various entities and private individuals contest decisions made by DOT, for example: permitting decisions with regard to driveways, highway vegetation removal, and outdoor advertising signs; decisions relating to the denial, suspension, and revocation of motor vehicle dealer licenses, and motor vehicle bond claims. Also, decisions relating to title and registration issues, driver school and instructor licenses, oversize/overweight permits are sometimes contested.

Eliminating all eligibility criteria for reimbursement of costs increases the number of parties eligible for cost recovery and creates new opportunities for entities with significant resources to contest DOT decisions and seek costs. Because costs cannot be awarded against unsuccessful appellants, there is no corresponding "downside risk" to requesting a hearing. As such, there is a potential for increased costs to the agency due to a potential increase in volume of contested cases, and other variables that cannot be fully ascertained.

Alternatively, the prospect of awarding costs to all businesses and individuals who are able to successfully contest decisions could have a chilling effect on DOT decision-making and the number of permit denials, sign removal orders and other agency administrative actions.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications